Appl. No.: 10/699,695 Atty. Docket No. 1131-0491P

Page 3 of 5

## REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application.

Claims 1-20 are currently being prosecuted. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his election of species requirement in view of the remarks as set forth hereinbelow.

## **ELECTION OF SPECIES REQUIREMENT**

The Examiner has set forth an election of species requirement with regard to the present application. The grouping of the claims is set forth as follows:

SPECIES	CLAIMS	SUBJECT MATTER
I	3 and 13	Filter Assembly/Method of Making wherein adhesive-applied parts constitute a continuous loop pattern
П	4 and 14	Filter Assembly/Method of Making wherein adhesive-applied parts constitute a meandering pattern
Ш	5, 8, 15 and 18	Filter Assembly/Method of Making wherein adhesive-applied parts constitute a bar pattern

The Examiner has indicated that claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 9-12 16, 17, 19 and 20 are generic to the three species identified above.

In order to be responsive to the Examiner's election of species requirement, Applicants have elected the species of **Group I** for initial examination. Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 9-13, 16, 17, 19 and 20 are readable on the elected species. The Examiner is respectfully requested to act on the elected claims.

The provisions of 37 CFR 1.146 state that a reasonable number of species are permitted in a

single application. The present application contains three (3) species. It is respectfully submitted

that the Examiner's election of species requirement is improper in view of the fact that a reasonable

number of species are set forth in the present application. If the Examiner determines that any of

the generic claims are allowable, then all of the claims of the present application should be

allowable.

. . . .

In order to be responsive to the Examiner's election of species requirement, claims 1-3, 6, 7,

9-13, 16, 17, 19 and 20 have been initially elected. If the Examiner does persist in his election of

species requirement, Applicants reserve the right to proceed with the filing of a divisional

application directed to non-elected species at a later date if they so desires.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF PRIORITY DOCUMENT

The Examiner has not acknowledged the Priority Document filed on November 4, 2003.

It is respectfully requested that the Examiner acknowledge Applicants' claim for foreign priority

in his next Office Action.

**DRAWINGS** 

The Examiner has not approved the Formal Drawings submitted by the Applicants. It is

respectfully submitted that the drawings comply with the requirements of the USPTO. If the

Examiner has any objections to the Formal Drawings he is respectfully requested to contact the

undersigned as soon as possible so that appropriate action may be taken. No further action is

believed to be necessary at this time unless the undersigned receives a notice from the Examiner.

Office Action dated September 28, 2004

Response filed October 19, 2004

Appl. No.: 10/699,695 Atty. Docket No. 1131-0491P

Page 5 of 5

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The Examiner is respectfully requested to acknowledge the Information Disclosure

Statement filed on November 4, 2003. An initialed copy of the PTO-1449 should be sent to the

undersigned at the earliest convenience of the Examiner.

Favorable action on the present application is earnestly solicited.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future

replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any

additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension

of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

Reg. No. 28,380

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

JMS/mlr 1131-0491P